

PUBLIC HEARING--Nov. 25, 1964

Appeal #7973 Louis A. Litman, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried with Mr. Clouser dissenting, the following Order was entered on December 1, 1964:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the side yard requirements of the R-1-B District to permit erection of a one-story rear addition to the dwelling at 4215 Alton Place, N.W., lot 23, square 1679, be granted.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) Appellant's lot has a frontage of 54 feet on Alton Place and depths of 101.17 and 86.11 feet to a sixteen foot wide public alley in the rear. The property has an area of 4005 square feet of land and is improved with a detached single-family residence.

(2) Appellant proposes to erect an addition 11 x 7 feet on the rear of the dwelling over an existing concrete slab in order to enlarge kitchen and make a dining area which at the present time is extremely small.

(3) The addition will provide a six foot six inch wide side yard whereas a minimum of eight feet is required under the existing regulations. The addition will be one-story in height. The existing side yard met requirements of regulations prior to 1958.

(4) The addition is removed twenty feet from the closest dwelling to the south which is the only property which might be affected by the addition.

(5) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

We are of the opinion that the appellant has proven a case of hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the regulations by the extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the specific property, and that the granting of this appeal can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan.

We are further of the opinion that light and air to adjoining properties will not be affected adversely as the proposed addition is practically even with the rear of the adjoining property to the south and is removed twenty feet therefrom.